IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL
WRIT PETITION NO. 680 (MS) OF 2006

Jitendra Kumar,
S/o Janeshwar Prasad,
R/o Village-Paniyla Chandapur,
Pargana-Bhagwanpur, Tehsil-Roorkee,
District-Haridwar.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

1. Consolidation Officer,
   Roorkee, Distrcit-Haridwar.
2. Ikbal, S/o Mahfooz Ali,
3. Abdul Salam, S/o Mahfooz Ali,
4. Mahboob S/o Mahfooz Ali,
5. Saheraj, S/o Mahfooz Ali,
   All 2 to 5 R/o Village-Bdheri Rajputan,
   Pargana & Tehsil – Roorkee,
   District – Haridwar.
6. Satendar Kumar, S/o Pratap Singh.
7. Rajendra Pal Marwaha, S/o Swatantra Kumar,
   Both 6 and 7 R/o House No. 301,
   Ramnagar Roorkee, Pargana & Tehsil – Roorkee,
   District – Haridwar. .....Respondents.

Dated: 09.06.2006

Hon'ble Rajesh Tandon, J.

Heard Sri Pramod Tiwari, Advocate for the petitioner and Standing Counsel for the respondent no. 1. Both the parties

have agreed that let the matter be finally disposed of at the admission stage.

By the present writ petition, the petitioner has prayed for a writ of mandamus directing the respondent no.1 to decide Case No. 52 and 935 Mahefooz (Ikbal & others) Vs. Satendar & others and Jitendar Vs. Ikbal & others under Section 12 & 9A(2) of the U.P. Consolidation of Holdings Act regarding Mauja – Badheri Rajputan, Pargana & Tehsil –Roorkee, District Haridwar expeditiously.

Petitioner has confined his prayer only for the disposal of the objections. The respondent no. 1 is directed to dispose of the objections within a period of four months from the date of presentation of the certified copy of the order.

Petitioner has prayed for the grant of status quo. A perusal of the order dated 02.04.2004 shows that there is already status quo by the District Magistrate on 2nd of April, 2004. In view of the above, liberty is given to the petitioner to represent before the Consolidation Officer by filing a copy of the same. However, the petitioner may file an application before the Consolidation officer for the grant of interim order if such an application is filed, the same may be considered by the Consolidation Officer.

Subject to the aforesaid, writ petition is dismissed. No order as to costs.

(Rajesh Tandon, J.)

09.06.2006
Rathour